

# V

## *Savages Again*

AFTER TWENTY CENTURIES of ideological controversy about “savages” and the lost primal world it may be impossible for us to look at the applicability of Pleistocene lifestyle options for the modern world without trailing biases, illusions, and romanticism about tribal people. The historical image of the savage suffers from two extreme views: the paragon of the noble savage at one limit, the loathsome brute at the other. The first is supported by a mythology of Golden Age legends. The second draws its energy from the history of cultural chauvinism—the idea of “savage” degradation and its “animalistic” expressions.

The idea that our primal ancestors had only a fuzzy and passive selfconsciousness has haunted anthropology and history for most of the twentieth century. “Primitive man,” said Jane Ellen Harrison in 1912, “submerged in his own reactions and activities, does not clearly distinguish himself as subject from the objects to which he reacts, and therefore has but slight consciousness of his own separate soul.”<sup>1</sup> Manuel Navarro, as late as 1924, said of the South American Campa: voracious brutes, “degraded and ignorant beings, they lead a life exotic, purely animal, savage, in which are eclipsed the faint glimmerings of their reason, in which are drowned the weak pangs of their conscience, and all the instincts and lusts of animal existence alone float and are reflected.”<sup>2</sup> Closer to home is the testimony of Will Durant, the historian: “Through 97 percent of history, man lived by hunting and nomadic pasturage. During those 975,000 years his basic character was formed—to greedy acquisitiveness, violent pugnacity and lawless sexuality.”<sup>3</sup>

“Humanist anthropologists” like Edward Tylor and Jacob Malinowski dismissed native religious rites as logical error but allowed that ritual might work psychologically. Although there have been bold voices among them, such as Marshal Sahlins’ *Stone Age Economics*, few anthropologists advocate a new primitivism. Their restraint is the result of a hard-won professional objectivity, the effort to overcome centuries of ethnocentrism, along with the pressures of cultural relativism in the social sciences, pioneered by Franz Boas and Alfred Kroeber.<sup>4</sup> As to the veracity of primal religions, an embarrassed silence has marked anthropology ever since. Robert Edgerton presents a menu of rotten behavior from one or another small society: rape, homicide, genital mutilation, wife beating, torture, child abuse, infanticide, and other antisocial traditions and beliefs. He claims that harmonious small societies never did exist and that the notion of primitive societies with more humane and kinder practices, a better ecology, less pathology, and a spiritual life in keeping with life on Planet Earth is a romantic fantasy. His colleagues, Edgerton says, failed to record the dark side of small societies. Their misleading reports are part of anthropology’s “relativist” attitude—no judgment of cultures other than their own.<sup>5</sup> Along with tribal-level farmers, he cites sedentary potlatch fishermen and domestic-ungulate-focused pastoralists whose lives are shaped by competition, ownership, and power alliances.<sup>6</sup> He does not acknowledge the psychopathic consequences of human density, the scale of suffering, or its wider environmental effects in mass societies. He speaks of “opposing interests” and “competing interests” among hunter/gatherers as though these were intrinsically destructive. But inequality is not necessarily bad: variations in size, strength, sex, and temperament are the basis of all animal societies. Edgerton’s examples are limited to habitat fringe groups: the Inuit, the Papuans, and the Siriono of Bolivia, for example. The Inuit and Papuans live at environmental extremes in perpetual snow or tropical forests—far from tundra, steppe, savanna, and forest edge in which *our ancestors* forged the kind of species we are. The Papuans and Inuit may be nearly as far from their evolutionary home as we are in cities. “Maladaptive” behavior is no surprise. All such small island, wet forest, and high arctic societies are deep into fending off evil and dangerous spirits.

The idea of the inherent “nobility” of the individual savage was laughed out of school a century ago, and properly so. Foragers are not always pacific (though they do not keep standing armies or make organized war), nor are they innocent of ordinary human vices and violence. In one or another group there is small-scale cruelty, infanticide, and inability or unwillingness to end intratribal scuffling or intertribal vengeance. Edgerton does allow that our Pleistocene genetic heritage is maladaptive in post-Pleistocene environments. Our craving for salt, sugar, and fat, for instance, is healthy in wild environments where salt is not normally superabundant, sugar stimulates the appetite for fresh fruit, and saturated fats are limited and wonderfully balanced in wild animals. Our built environments, moreover, may also be maladaptive as well as unhealthful. Are environments of stone and concrete psychically toxic, or is it having more than a few dozen people around at once that creates our unexplainable syndromes?

Edgerton knows that relativism based on multiculturalism only goes so far. Human psychobiology, he admits, is the same everywhere (but not the cultural response to it). There are universal human needs and characteristics, many of which are positive. We inherit, he says, such things as a predisposition for ways of life that are nomadic, we

divide tasks by gender, and favor social arrangements that are typically sharing and mutually supportive. This perspective stands in sharp contrast to the Freudian psychocentric notion that “primitives” are like children or Kroeber’s view of them as psychopathic. Contrary to the skepticism about primitive cultures, perspectives from various quarters—the study of higher primates, hominid paleontology, Paleolithic archaeology, ethology, ecology, field studies of living hunter/gatherers, direct testimony from living hunter/gatherers — provide powerful examples for thoughtful speculation about our ancient ancestors. Revelations come from the meticulous ransacking of old campfire sites, the artifacts of ceremony and the ensemble of art as the tangible evidence of mind, analogies to the eating strategies of other species, and the social and ecological homologies with living foraging peoples.

HOSTILITY TO THE IDEA that we have anything to learn from savages has a long tradition. For two centuries the ideology of progress set its values opposed to fictional images of deprived and depraved savages. It is the whole of personal existence, from birth through death, among those whom history calls “preagricultural” peoples that is the strength of a Pleistocene way of life.

Much is to be learned from today’s hunter/gatherers despite the fact that contemporary hunters are not our ancestors.<sup>7</sup> Although we cannot declare that past cultures are repeated unequivocally in the present, we can assume that there are similarities between peoples whose lifestyle is comparable whether they be archaic or modern foragers. After the proceedings of a Wenner-Gren symposium in Chicago were published as *Man the Hunter* in 1968, it was clear that categorizing primitive humans as either brutish cavemen or noble savages was an erroneous interpretation of the complexity of original culture. Field-workers who had studied living tribal peoples in many parts of the world came together and found common threads that linked diverse hunter/gatherer cultures to one another and to Paleolithic archaeology.<sup>8</sup>

All people instinctively differentiate among themselves socially. But cultures differ in their criteria for doing so. Among hunter/gatherers the criteria tend to be age, gender, and ability; in complex societies the social distinctions are more often wealth, power, and kingship. In the bosom of family and society, the life cycle is punctuated by formal social recognition with its metaphors in the terrain and the sentient plant and animal life surrounding the human community. Typical characteristics of family-level economy, say Allen Johnson and Timothy Earle, are low population density, personal tools, familiar seasonal rhythms of aggregation and dispersion, nonterritoriality, no war of professional soldiers or standing armies, familiar ceremonialism, an ad hoc leadership, and much personal choice, including risk taking.<sup>9</sup> In the last two centuries individuals in primal societies have been given short shrift and depicted as sacrifices to mass impulse, un-self-reflective organisms who are utterly dependent on the tribe. This supposed lack of selfconsciousness has given us a picture in the hands of classical authors and modern psychiatrists of some defective state in human evolution that awaited civilization. According to anthropologist Elman Service, however, “an individual adult participates much more fully in every aspect of the culture than do the people of more complicated societies. . . . Human beings in primitive society are personalized and individuated.”<sup>10</sup>

Among Ituri pygmies, “outrageously boastful men and extremely shrewd women,” who show “humor, gaiety, reflectiveness,” all “contradict the conventional image of preliterate peoples as divested of ego and personality.”

<sup>11</sup> comments sociologist Murray Bookchin. One leads by assent of others—by listening, arguing, suggesting, and reflecting a consensus, a spontaneous accord that always has limits. “The open competition of leadership in an Indian community,” says geneticist James V. Neel, “probably results in leadership being based far less on accidents of birth and far more on innate characteristics than in our culture.”

<sup>12</sup> Anthropology itself has contributed to a picture of wild men in a bloody melee. “Because we read so much about animism and magic, totemism and demons, we come to identify primitive people with these things unintentionally and to imagine them as always plagued by demons, or running into taboos, and passing their lives in a chronic state of terror,” observes Geza Roheim.<sup>13</sup> Interpersonal and gender relations are worked out in the context of daily life of hunting/gathering and sharing, where leadership does not take on special significance. Colin Turnbull says: “In terms of a conscious dedication to human relationships that are both affective and effective, the primitive is ahead of us all the way.”<sup>14</sup>

Group size in foraging groups is ideal for human relationships—including vernacular roles for men and women without sexual exploitation. The idea of a vernacular gender was widely misunderstood in the antagonistic atmosphere of the 1980s, in the anger that repudiated four thousand years of male sovereignty.<sup>15</sup> Men and women are unlike because of their evolution, a matter not to be deplored but to be celebrated and fulfilled, with the caution that power over the other is not part of the difference. Roles and duties are divided, but not to make inequality. A vernacular society, divided in many of its social and familial responsibilities and privileges, would be inappropriately dominated by either gender.

Men and women have different roles in the group, similar and yet different bodies and psyches, shared but also different satisfactions, desires, fears, and sorrows. In small-group societies such a complementarity is both beautiful and efficient. Yet diversity of sexual orientation or social role is respected as well. In such societies those who are ambiguous socially or sexually, who do not marry and have children, are not penalized but occupy legitimate roles. Marjorie Shostak in her study of the !Kung San asserts that although “men’s status is sometimes higher than women’s, still it must be said that “women have considerable voice in group affairs and considerable control over their own lives (that is, in terminating an unsatisfactory marriage). In these respects they may be more egalitarian than most other societies, including our own.”<sup>16</sup>

Health is good among the !Kung San in terms of diet as well as social relationships.<sup>17</sup> They eat 80 of the 262 species of animals they know, but with no effect on the animal populations. James V. Neel observes “The high level of maternally derived antibodies, early exposure to pathogens, the prolonged period of lactation, and the generally excellent nutritional status of the child make it possible for a *relatively* smooth transition from passive to active immunity to many of the agents of disease to which he is exposed.”<sup>18</sup>

How much do foragers work? “No group on earth has more leisure time than hunters and gatherers, who spend it on games, conversation and relaxing,” according to Frank Hole and Kent V. Flannery.<sup>19</sup> Among the Nunamiut Eskimos, “Umialit (rich men) were considered very intelligent men who carefully observed the habits of all the animals and the conditions affecting them: climatic, topographic, other animals, and the presence of men.”<sup>20</sup> The “fashionable, male-oriented hunting models,” according to Glynn Isaac and Diana Crader, have little to do with true foraging cultures. The taking of wild meat and its use, particularly, involve a division of labor, food sharing, information on the past and future, long-term mating bonds, joint care of the offspring, “networks of reciprocity, spiraling developments in communications, and intragroup cooperation.”<sup>21</sup>

The beauty of Pleistocene “work” is that as such it hardly exists in the sense of the modern concept of labor and hourly drudgery. The work week is about seventeen hours, and although carrying meat or wood to camp may have its tedious moments, most of hunting and gathering activities, as well as dancing and games, exercise those muscle and coordination complexes that we now see as beneficial exercise. Running is particularly evident.

Among foragers the esteem gained in sharing and giving outweighs the advantages of hoarding. According to Richard Borshay Lee, “there is no evidence for exploitation on the basis of sex or age” and sharing (other than sex) is the most singular ideal and obligation.<sup>22</sup> The only private property is personally constructed things. The worst accusations are stinginess and browbeating. Among hunters and gatherers custom firmly modulates human frailty and irascibility. Fights are more likely to be over sex, adultery, and betrothal than land and resources. Land “ownership” is a collective understanding. Outsiders are not excluded. Mobility allows for easy dispersal and joining, splitting and coalescing, for social or ecological reasons. Organized war does not exist. Ecological affinities are stable and nonpolluting. There is, says Lee, “a continuous struggle against one’s own selfish, arrogant, and antisocial impulses. . . . A sharing way of life is not only possible but has actually existed in many parts of the world and over long periods of time.”

People living in primitive societies do not seek to move to higher human density situations, but instead move to lower-density areas where resources are more abundant. As Johnson and Earle have shown with the Michiguenga in Peru, “as long as wild foods remained abundant, the village succeeded in handling the numerous tensions of group life.” When resources became scarce, however, tensions arose “and disputes erupted into open conflicts” that were resolved by moving the whole village to a new site.<sup>23</sup>

When on rare occasions “there is disagreement over hunting plans, it is usually resolved by making one’s views known to all and reaching an acceptable consensus of opinion through public discussions participated in by both males and females,” says Susan Kent of the Bushmen.<sup>24</sup> Lee explains that differences in skills do not necessarily create friction: “The correlation between hunting success and social status is minimal and tends not to be emphasized.” There is much variation among the men in hunting skill—in fact, one-third of them kill two-thirds of the game. There is no traditional way for a man to be a nonhunter, but an individual may not hunt for many months. If there are slim days the !Kung San do not go hungry for long, compared to the northern Ghana farmers.

Says Lee: “There is still no evidence for a weight loss . . . even remotely approaching the magnitude of loss observed among agriculturists.”<sup>25</sup> Hunting is associated with an equitable division of labor between men and women: food sharing within the extended family and even wider information sharing about daily experience and the tribal past.<sup>26</sup> Hunting has never excluded women. Their lives are as absorbed in the encounter with animals, alive and dead, as are the men’s. The hunt is a continuum that includes the entire community, from its first plan to its storied retelling, from the social analogies to the behavior of carnivores to metaphors on food chains to prayers of apology and thanksgiving. Traditionally the large, dangerous mammals are usually hunted by men, but it has never been claimed

that women only pluck and men only kill.

The centrality of meat, the sentience and spiritual source from whom it comes, the diverse activities in its preparation and distribution, the animal's numinous presence after its death—all entail a wide range of roles, many of which are genderized. Insofar as the animal eaten is available because it has learned “to give away,” there is no more virtue in the actual chase or killing than the transformation of its skin into a garment, the burying of its bones, the drumming that sustains the whole group as dancer of the mythical hunt, or the dandling of infants as the story of the hunt is told. Women sing the spirit of the slain animal a welcome to the hearth where she is the hostess. Among the Sharanahua of South America, when the women are meathungry they send the men off to hunt and sing the hunters to their task.

They are commonly said to transform boys into hunters. Anthropologist Janet Siskind says: “The social pressure of the special hunt, the line of women painted and waiting, makes young men try hard to succeed.”<sup>27</sup> Gathering, like hunting, is a lighthearted affair done by both men and women. The stable sexual politics of the Sharanahua, “based on mutual social and economic dependence, allows for the open expression of hostility,” a combination of solidarity and antagonism that “prevents the households from becoming tightly closed units.”<sup>28</sup>

Since a critical dimension of the hunt is the confrontation with death and the incorporation of substance in new life, women are traditionally regarded as keepers of the mystery of death-as-the-genetrix-of-life in all expressions of sharing and giving away. The hunt is clearly connected with feminine secrets and powers—with the Greek goddess Artemis, for example, and her other avatars such as the archaic “Lady of the Beasts.” Paleolithic female figurines occur in sanctuaries where the walls are painted with hunted game.

More value is placed on men than women only as the hunt is perverted by sexism and training for war. Among the !Kung San the women collect small animals but do not hunt. Their nonhunting is not an issue, however, nor an area of abrasion between the sexes. Perhaps sexism comes into being with the doting on fertility and fecundity in agriculture and the androgynous “reply” of nomadic, male-dominated societies of pastoralism.

The metaphysics of meat embraces a range of activity. Excessive genderizing about meat-eating is a popular issue. Human carnivory takes nothing from foraging women who, like people everywhere, prefer meat. In the anthropology of the 1980s and 1990s there has been a continuing discussion of primitive diets—in part because of the general public repudiation of “red meat,” which has been shown to contribute to high levels of cholesterol. Not all “red meat” is high in cholesterol, however. In contrast to domestic animals, the fats in wild animals, including seal and walrus, are unsaturated.<sup>29</sup>

According to Lee, the better hunters do not “dominate politics” or play the role of “big man.” Modesty and understatement are admired and there is communal pressure to be a good, generous hunter. There is no clear focus of authority or enforcement. The participation of women in group politics is “greater than that of women in most tribal, peasant and industrial societies.” Meat is distributed according to kinship and friendships and the circumstances of the kill; even the maker of the arrow is important. <sup>30</sup> Bookchin comments: “the most important attributes of citizenship derive more directly from the tribal world than the village world, from rude shelters rather than houses . . . [towns subvert] the conditions for an active, participatory body politic.”<sup>31</sup> Something enormously powerful binds living hunter/gatherers to all those of the past and to modern sportsmen, who are no exception to the best traditions of the ancient hunt. That something is the way the hunt satisfies the demands of the genome. Hunting is a kind of cross-cultural theme. Metaphorically understood, the hunt refers to the larger quest for the way: the pursuit of meaning and contact with a sentient part of the environment and the intuition that nature is a language. In a sense hunting is a special case of gathering. Antihunters, including many academics and historians, are too quick to accuse hunters of brutality and to cite naturalists like Aldo Leopold, George Bird Grinnell, William Temple Hornaday, or Henry Thoreau as nonhunters or at least reformed hunters. Thomas Altherr and John Reiger have rightly taken the intellectuals to task for their poor scholarship in these matters.<sup>32</sup>

Hunting, moreover, is sometimes confused with war because many suppose that weapons and aggression are the crux of the hunt. The repugnance often expressed toward hunting is emotionally inextricable from the horror of war. The innocence of the hunted animals, the use of weapons of war against those without weapons, the seeming vainglory in the “trophy” hunt, the apparent infliction of unnecessary pain, the associated atavisms such as violence, aggression, and ferocity, the human adoption of the model of the dire carnivore, the association with commercialization and intoxication—all these and more weigh against the hunt as a falling away from things civilized. The difficulty is that, although there is truth in these criticisms today, the analogy of the hunt to warfare and crime is deeply wrong. Hunting and gathering interplay mind and attention with logic and compassion for the land, forests, water, plants, and animals. Modern sportsmanship and its ethics of the hunter's voluntary restraint constitute a last barrier against the corruption of hunting. The sense of sanctity and perfection with which primal

people glow is a reflection of something essential in human nature. It has to do with an insight about the world—vouchsafed to us all but realized in hunting/gathering cultures—obscured by the inroads of all other ways of life. There is an ineluctable way of being human on this planet, in a world of others, where the flow of life is also the flow of death. Susan Kent says that in “groups without domestic animals, both human and non-human animals are viewed as having an intellect—that is, sentience, sociability and intelligence—and a common mythical ancestry with humans,” a kinship that is not shared with plants although the latter may have ritual significance.

33

“Hunters” is an appropriate term for a society in which meat, the best of foods, signifies the gift of life incarnate—the obtaining and preparation of which ritualizes the encounter of life and death. The human kinship with animals is faced in its ambiguity, and the quest of all elusive things is experienced as the hunt’s most emphatic metaphor. Mistakes about this mode of life hound even anthropologists, some of whom confuse predation with hunting and see hunters only as food extractors.<sup>34</sup> The contrary is true. Foraging peoples typically spend thousands of hours every year pondering and studying the animals around them and discussing the events of the day. The animals are numinous and oracular signifiers. In their most subtle moves, they are watched and studied with dedicated determination.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL HAS ARGUED, rightly, that death was a metaphysical problem for the original hunter. He concluded, wrongly, that it was solved by planters who made sacrifices to forces governing the annual sprouting of grain. It was control, not acquiescence to this great round, that the agriculturists sought. In the dawn of the modern world, the Neolithic, says Wilhelm Dupre, “the individual no longer stands as a whole vis-à-vis the life-community in the sense that the latter finds its realization through a total integration of the individual—as is the case by and large under the conditions of a gathering and hunting economy.”<sup>35</sup>

Unlike agrarians and pastoralists, foragers do not perceive nature as simply a larder in which the animals are mere objects in a game of power and wealth. It would be wrong to see this play as a ravagement. Subtlety, restraint, cogitation, and cooperation are its guiding principles. Ferocity has its place, not as a melody, but as a chord. The beleaguered modern tycoon who says of his work, “It’s a jungle out there,” is in error about the real jungle. His metaphor is a self-serving misrepresentation of the wilderness that made him possible.

From the time of Vasco da Gama, Westerners have been fascinated by indigenous punishment for crimes and by cannibalism (although cannibalism is primarily a trait of horticulturists). Being subject to ordinary human shortcomings, hunter/gatherers may not always live in perfect harmony with nature or each other. Nor are they always happy, content, well fed, free of disease, or profoundly philosophical. Like people everywhere they are, in some sense, incompetent.<sup>36</sup>

Melvin Konner, Harvard-bred anthropologist, who spent years studying the !Kung San of the Kalahari Desert of Africa, wrote of the superiority of their lives to their counterparts in Cleveland or Manchester—and then pulled the covers over his head by saying, “But here is the bad news. You can’t go back.”<sup>37</sup> One can only be grateful for Loren Eiseley and Laurens Van der Post, writing on the same Kalahari Bushmen, and for their anticipation of what Roger Keesing calls a “new ethnography” that seeks “universal cultural design” based on psychological approaches.<sup>38</sup> “If a cognitive anthropology is to be productive,” he says, “we will need to seek underlying processes and rules.” He concludes that “the assumption of radical diversity in cultures can no longer be sustained by linguistics.”<sup>39</sup> Which is to say that linguistic differences are merely one of the freedoms made possible by the genome.

We are free to create culture—and have done so in hundreds of ways—but there is a catch. The biological function of culture is probably the versatility that it offers to a traveling species, whose environment differs widely and whose experiences are diversely assimilated and built upon, and who need to keep their sense of identity. For thousands of years culture helped set small groups of people apart from each other by embedding their customs and skills and by semi-isolating linguistic and genetic groups. The catch is that, given a natural world and a human nature, not all cultures work equally well. The most rewarding theme was that it was the small-group foraging people who developed the general human niche during the evolution of the genome—the genome which in turn would expect just that sort of small group.

## NOTES

1. Jane Ellen Harrison, *Themis* (New York: University Books, 1962), p. 475.
2. Manuel Navarro, *La Tribu Campa* (Lima, 1924), quoted in Gerald Weiss, "Campa Cosmology," *American Museum of Natural History Anthropological Papers* 52, pt. 5 (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1975).
3. Dr. Will Durant, "A Last Testament to Youth," *Columbia Dispatch Magazine*, Feb. 8, 1970.
4. Derek Freeman, letter, *Current Anthropology*, October 1973, p. 379.
5. Robert B. Edgerton, *Sick Societies: Challenging the Myth of Primitive Harmony* (New York: Free Press, 1992), pp. 1–104.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
7. Sherwood L. Washburn, ed., *The Social Life of Early Man* (New York: Wenner Gren, 1961); G. P. Murdock, *Ethnographic Atlas for New World Societies* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967). The shift toward species-specific thinking benefited from "the new systematics," an evolutionary perspective from genetics and natural selection articulated by George G. Simpson, Ernst Myer, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Julian Huxley, and others. Next came *The Social Life of Early Man*, the new discovery of continuity among primitive societies, later given cross-cultural generalizations in George Murdock's ethnographic atlas.
8. Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Man the Hunter* (Chicago: Aldine, 1968).
9. Allen W. Johnson and Timothy Earle, *The Evolution of Human Societies from Foraging Group to Agrarian State* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1987), 28–61.
10. Elman R. Service, *The Hunters*, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979), p. 83.
11. Murray Bookchin, *The Rise of Urbanization and the Decline of Citizenship* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1987), p. 27.
12. James V. Neel, "Lessons from a 'Primitive' People," *Science* 170 (3960) (20 November 1970): 818.
13. Geza Roheim, *Children of the Desert* (New York: Basic Books, 1974).
14. Colin Turnbull, *The Human Cycle* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983), p. 21.
15. Ivan Illich, *Gender* (New York: Pantheon, 1982).
16. Marjorie Shostak, "A !Kung Woman's Memories of Childhood," in Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., *Kalahari Hunters and Gatherers* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 277.
17. Gina Bari Kolata, "!Kung Hunter-Gatherers: Feminism, Diet, and Birth Control," *Science* 195 (4276) (28 January 1977): 382–338.
18. Neel, "Lessons from a 'Primitive' People," p. 819.
19. Frank Hole and Kent V. Flannery, "The Prehistory of Southwestern Iran: A Preliminary Report," *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 33 (1963): 201.
20. Michael Jochim, *Hunter-Gatherer Subsistence and Settlement: A Predictive Model* (New York: Academic Press, 1976), p. 22, quoting N. J. Gubser, *The Nunamint Eskimos: Hunters of Caribou* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).
21. Glynn L. I. Isaac and Diana C. Crader, "To What Extent Were Early Hominids Carnivorous? An Archaeological Perspective," in Harding and Teleki, eds., *Omnivorous Primates*, pp. 37–103.
22. Richard Borshay Lee, *The !Kung San* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 459–460.
23. Johnson and Earle, *From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*, pp. 82.
24. Susan Kent, "Cross-Cultural Perceptions of Farmers and Hunters and the Value of Meat," in Susan Kent, ed., *Farmers as Hunters* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 4.
25. Lee, *!Kung San*, p. 296.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 437.
27. Janet Siskind, *To Hunt in the Morning* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 101.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
29. Alan E. Mann, "Diet and Evolution," in Harding and Teleki, eds.,
30. Lee, *!Kung San*, pp. 343–346.
31. Bookchin, *The Rise of Urbanization*, p. 28.
32. Thomas L. Altherr and John F. Reiger, "Academic Historians and Hunting: A Call for More and Better Scholarship," *Environmental History Review* 19(3) (Fall 1995). Besides Ortega y Gasset's classic statement on the ethics and cosmology of the hunt there are excellent treatises such as James A. Swan's beautiful book, *In Defense of Hunting* (San Francisco: Harper, 1995); Charles Clifton's "Hunter's Eucharist," *Gnosis* Fall 1993; and Matt Cartmill's *A View to Death in the Morning* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1993).
33. Kent, "Cross-Cultural Perceptions," p. 11.
34. Tim Ingold, *The Appropriation of Nature: Essays on Human Ecology and Social Relations* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1987).
35. Wilhelm Dupre, *Religion in Primitive Cultures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1975), pp. 327–328.
36. In the movie *Little Big Man* the Indian actor Dan George did an unforgettable satire on the wise old chief who, delivering his rhetoric of joining the Great Spirit, lies down on the mountain to die and gets only rain in the face for his trouble.
37. Melvin Konner, *The Tangled Wing: Biological Constraints on the Human Spirit* (New York: Holt, 1982).
38. Loren Eiseley, "Man of the Future," in *The Immense Journey* (New York: Random House, 1959). Laurens van der Post, *The*

*Heart of the Hunter* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980).

39. Roger M. Keesing, "Paradigms Lost: The New Ethnography and New Linguistics," *Southwest Journal of Anthropology* 28 (1972): 299–332.